

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification and rejected claims 1-13. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 11 are amended herein, and new claim 14 is added. Claims 4-6, 8, 10, 12 and 13 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is presented. Proper support for the amendments can be found at least in FIG. 13 and corresponding text of the present application.

Thus, claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11 and 14 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION:**

At item 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification and the Abstract of the present application. The Abstract and pertinent portions of the present application are amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,555,369 (Menendez) and U.S. Patent No. 6,591,366 (Munker), U.S. Patent No. 5,860,070 (Tow) and U.S. Patent No. 6,421,653 (May).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of the Menendez palette (207) providing generic components representing graphical interface elements in with the present invention that selectively determines a usable interface that is usable with a component for developing an application program. However, Menendez requires a user to create views on a layout window by selecting a component from the palette (207), or by selecting from a proto layout window defining components (see, col. 2, lines 32-45 and col. 9, lines 44-52). That is, Menendez requires that a user select components from the palette of components or use a generic layout relating to all available components of the system.

Moreover, Munker is limited to initiating a loading of information of hardware components only if a user has authorization to initiate the loading (see, col. 5, lines 46-51), and Tow is directed to locking keys of a database to prevent insertion of rows/columns into the database (see, FIG. 3 and corresponding text).

The Examiner asserts that col. 2, line 60 through col. 3, line 3 of Tow discloses insertion of data into a table where permission is required to perform an update. However, as explicitly

indicated at col. 2, line 60 through col. 3, line 3 of Tow, "Before a program is permitted to insert a row or update the key ton an existing row, the index is checked to ensure that the proposed key value does not conflict with an existing key value." Accordingly, Tow teaches away from the present invention that enables an interface to be embedded into components that are used by the application program (see detailed discussion of independent claims below).

The Examiner also relies on May as teaching a class group modification interface that determines unassigned (invalid) and assigned (valid) groups of valid entities (users) and usable records. However, May is limited to displaying information of all legal entities that have access to the system such that a user customizes the user's class groups by selecting from the displayed information encompassing the entities (see, FIGS. 8A and 8B and corresponding text).

The present invention sets or prescribes a usable interface when a user selects a component (i.e., without requiring the user to have knowledge of useable interfaces of each of the components). For example, as illustrated in FIG.13 of the present application, an interface setting process (S26) is repeated and the interface is permitted to be embedded into a plurality of components used by an application program. This enables the present invention to embed a selected interface into a plurality of components used by the application program without restriction of inhibiting the conflict with an existing interface.

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites that the present invention sets "whether said selected interface is permitted to be embedded into said application program in accordance with preset information indicative of usable interfaces corresponding to said selected component" and the interface is "permitted to be embedded into a plurality of components used by said application program."

Similarly, independent claims 7, 9 and 11 recite, "setting whether said selected interface is permitted to be embedded into said application program", where the interface is "permitted to be embedded into a plurality of components used by said application program."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1, 7, 9 and 11.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, the program development device of claim 3 includes, "a group definition module defining a group consisting of a plurality of users" and "a group

specifying module specifying a usable set record with respect to the group." The cited references do not teach or suggest these features of claim 3.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM:**

New claim 14 has been added to recite, "providing a first list of usable interfaces responsive to a first component being selected and providing a second list of usable interfaces different from the first list responsive to a second component being selected." New claim 14 further recites, "developing the application program by embedding the first component selected from the first list of usable interfaces and the second component selected from the second list of usable interfaces into components used by the application program."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, "developing the application program by embedding the first component selected from the first list of usable interfaces and the second component selected from the second list of usable interfaces into components used by the application program", as recited in new claim 14.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-7-06  
1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

By: 

John C. Garvey  
Registration No. 28,607